- 1. What are the greatest threats to the existing network of parks and open spaces? Are there criteria that can be guide the development of recreation opportunities and minimize potential impacts to sensitive species and natural habitat?
- 2. California has a demographic base that is as diverse as its landscapes. Does the current configuration of parks and open space meet the needs of demographic groups; providing equitable access to open space? Are there data sets or criteria that can be used to better understand which groups have limited access to open space?
- 3. Should ecosystem services (e.g. habitat provision, protecting water resources, carbon sequestration...) be considered as an equal priority for parks and open spaces? Are there any intrinsic qualities about landscape that we are not considering in our discussion of open space? What role if any should active management play in preserving the environmental quality of these lands? For example, should we encourage treatments that reduce risk of high severity wildfire or the spread of disease?
- 4. Can the configuration of parks and open spaces serve as broader network of protected areas that enhance the conservation of forest ecosystems? Given differences in land ownership and management objectives are there tools available that can help promote a broader conservation framework?
- 5. Are there good examples of parks and open spaces being used effectively to support multiple uses (e.g. recreation, watershed protection, habitat restoration...)? If the open space is managed for multiple uses does that mean that all uses should hold equal weight, or should some activities be given a higher priority?
- 6. Parks and open spaces (both urban and rural) provide immense value beyond recreational opportunities. Please discuss important factors and possible tools that can be used to evaluate the broader benefits from these lands.